

REMARKS

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 33-37, 39-41 and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cukor et al. (USP 5,168,444) (“Cukor”) and *Digital Imaging Technology: What, Where, and Why in Commercial Nuclear Power* by Tim Reding (“Reding”), and in further view of Seto et al. (USP 6,157,914) (“Seto”). The independent claims, claims 33, 34, and 35 have been cancelled thereby making this rejection moot. New claims 46, 47, and 48 have been added to more clearly define the invention. It is respectfully submitted that Cukor, Reding, and Seto, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the features set forth in independent claims 46, 47, and 48.

As previously addressed in the earlier responses, the present invention is distinct from the prior art for a variety of reasons, particularly with respect to the unique features that exist at the local customer service units. For example, one claimed feature includes the option to restrict users to only retrieve images that are locally stored. Cukor does not show or suggest the ability to restrict retrieval of images to only those locally stored. Indeed, in Cukor documents are inputted at remote stations and transmitted to the central processing station for further processing such as indexing and commodity entry and invoicing (col. 11, line 17 – col. 12, line 15; col. 12, lines 16-24). Distinct from the present invention, Cukor does not teach restricting access to local storage because the documents in Cukor are further processed.

Further, Seto and Reding do not teach or suggest the claimed features and the option of restricting users to images that are only locally stored. For example, the objective in Seto

is to provide a medical support system which centrally manages medical information created by different hospitals and to permit the exchange of information among hospitals. Seto teaches the retrieval of data directly from the centralized management system without the option to restrict users to only locally stored image files (col. 1, lines 54-60; col. 6, lines 12-49).

Claim 38 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cukor, Reding and Seto as applied to claim 33, and further in view of *A shortcut in the paper chase* by Joe Dysart (“Dysart”). Because claim 38 has been amended to depend from new claim 46, the remarks presented above are also applicable to claim 38.


Claim 42 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cukor, Reding and Seto as applied to claims 35 and 36, and further in view of Wang et al. (USP 5,490,217)(“Wang”). Because claim 42 has been amended to depend from new claim 46, the remarks presented above are also applicable to claim 42.

CONCLUSION

Claims 37-46 are pending in the application. It is respectfully submitted that the prior art, alone and in combination, do not show or suggest the features of claims 37-46. Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below. No further fees are believed due, however, if there are any fees due, please charge to deposit account No. 501458.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/8/04
Kilpatrick Stockton, LLP
607 14th Street, N.W., Suite 900
Washington, D.C. 20005
Phone: (202) 508-5800
Fax: (202) 508-5858

By: 
John Ball,
Registration No. 44,433